

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-47 are currently pending. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, claims 1-48 will be pending. Applicants seek to add new claim 48.

Applicants rely on 37 CFR §1.7, the “Saturday, Sunday, Holiday” rule, to file this timely response.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 1, 4, 21, 22, 28, 32, 33-38, 40, 41, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,143,825 to Beren et al. (“Beren Patent”). Applicants traverse these rejections.

The Beren Patent does not teach functionalized *blends* as recited in the pending claims. The Office Action misapplies the disclosure of the so called third component of the Beren Patent described at col.4, lines 65+. This component is not a *blend* of polymers as recited in Applicants’ claims. Further, unlike Applicants’ claims 45-48, which recited adhesive compositions composed of functionalized blends as major portion, the Beren Patent describes compositions composed of only 3-30 wt.% of a grafted polymer.

The Office Action’s response to Applicants’ arguments regarding *blends* is unclear because it analogizes: (a) a blend of polymers having a component this is functionalized, with (b) a blend of polymers that is functionalized. These two compositions are distinct. Adding a functionalized component to a blend does not provide the same results as functionalizing the entirety of a blend of polymers.

Moreover, the Beren Patent does not teach a functionalized *blend* that includes a “branchy” polymer component. Although the Beren Patent teaches a component having a branching index, i.e., the “high melt strength polymer”, this component is not part of a *blend* that is functionalized as recited in the pending claims.

The Office Action’s response to Applicants’ arguments regarding the branchy index lower limit is unclear because the response does not address Applicants’ argument that the branched component is not functionalized in a blend.

Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 1, 4, 21, 22, 28, 32, 33-38, 40, 41, and 44 are respectfully requested.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse these rejections.

The recited ranges are provided at in the as-filed application at p.25, lines 9-14. At p.20, lines 25+, Applicants describe that functionalized blends can be combined with other additives. Later at p.25, Applicants describe the content of additives that may be combined with functionalized blends, including less than 25 wt.%, less than 10 wt.%, and less than 5 wt.% of additives, which leaves 75 wt.% or greater, 90 wt.% or greater, or 95 wt.% or greater of functionalized blend.

The Office Action cites degree/level of functionalization, not adhesive component ranges.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Beren Patent in view of International Publication No. WO 2003/033612 to Wang et al. (“Wang Publication”) or U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0007033 to Karandinos et al. (“Karandinos publication”). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Neither the Beren Patent, the Wang Publication, nor the Karandinos Publication, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest adhesive compositions composed of functionalized blends as recited in the pending claims.

Neither the Wang publication nor the Karandinos publication cure the deficiencies of the Beren Patent as described above. Although the Wang publication describes blends of syndiotactic polypropylene and amorphous polypropylene, there is no teaching or suggestion of functionalizing the *blended* formulation.

Similarly to the Wang publication, the Karandinos publication does not teach or suggest functionalizing blends. The Patent Office’s previously submitted Notice Of Allowance mailed September 27, 2007 admits “the polymers disclosed in the prior art of KARANDINOS are not functionalized.” See Reasons for Allowance, p.4.

One skilled in the art would not be motivated to achieve adhesive formulations recited in the pending claims based on the teaching or suggestion of the Beren Patent, the Wang

Publication, nor the Karandinos Publication because the formulations taught by these references are, perforce, different from those recited by Applicants. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to achieve the recited adhesive compositions composed of functionalized blends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants believe that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the pending Office Action. Accordingly, an early and favorable reconsideration of the rejection, and allowance of pending claims 1-48 are requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge counsel's Deposit Account No. 05-1712, for any fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, required to make this response timely and acceptable to the Office.

Respectfully,

Date: Sept.8, 2008

/Stephen Timmins/  
Stephen Timmins  
Registration No. 48,481

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):  
ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Telephone No. (281) 834-2866  
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495